

Date: Wed, 2 Mar 94 04:30:14 PST
From: Ham-Policy Mailing List and Newsgroup <ham-policy@ucsd.edu>
Errors-To: Ham-Policy-Errors@UCSD.Edu
Reply-To: Ham-Policy@UCSD.Edu
Precedence: Bulk
Subject: Ham-Policy Digest V94 #92
To: Ham-Policy

Ham-Policy Digest Wed, 2 Mar 94 Volume 94 : Issue 92

Today's Topics:

CW

Getting an US license.

Morse Whiners

On the lite side...

rec.dan.pickersgill.monologue

What? No comments??

Send Replies or notes for publication to: <Ham-Policy@UCSD.Edu>

Send subscription requests to: <Ham-Policy-REQUEST@UCSD.Edu>

Problems you can't solve otherwise to brian@ucsd.edu.

Archives of past issues of the Ham-Policy Digest are available (by FTP only) from UCSD.Edu in directory "mailarchives/ham-policy".

We trust that readers are intelligent enough to realize that all text herein consists of personal comments and does not represent the official policies or positions of any party. Your mileage may vary. So there.

Date: Tue, 01 Mar 94 09:08:48 EST

From: ihnp4.ucsd.edu!swrinde!gatech!news.ans.net!malgudi.oar.net!wariat.org!
mystis!dan@network.ucsd.edu

Subject: CW

To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

xraytech@sugar.NeoSoft.COM (A great x ray technician!) writes:

> In article <6BNHic1w165w@mystis.wariat.org>,
> Dan Pickersgill <dan@mystis.wariat.org> wrote:
> >fmdavis@bnr.ca (Fred M. Davis) writes:
> >
> >> In article <2D726467@msmail.uthscsa.edu>
> >> MUENZLERK@uthscsa.EDU (Muenzler, Kevin) writes:
> >>
> >>> I don't know guys, maybe I'm weird. I have always liked CW.
> >>> I have my DXCC with CW on 4 bands. I have found that there are

```
> >> > many many times where phone was either difficult or impossible
> >> > and CW was not a problem. It is much easier to copy a very
> >> > weak and noisy CW signal than a weak and noisy phone signal.
> >> > Don't forget, ham radio began in CW. I think that CW is the
> >> > very basis of amateur radio and should always be that way.
> >
> >> Absolutely. Try working 40 meters phone at night barefoot, if you
> >> can find a quiet spot. Then try it with CW, even in QRM'd areas.
> >> There's nothing like a nice CW QSO with the narrow filter on;
> >> phone just can't compete.
> >
> >> Fred VA3FD
> >
> >And other modes will beat that. It still does not make testing relevant.
>
> And relevant is a euphemism for easy.
>
> --Robert [WA3J]
```

No Robert, relevant means relevant.

I realize it is a big word for such a SMALL person.

--
Samuel Adams:"The Constitution shall never be construed to prevent people of the United States who are peaceable citizens from keeping their own arms."
During Massachusetts' U.S. Constitution ratification convention, (1788)

Date: Tue, 01 Mar 94 10:17:39 EST
From: ihnp4.ucsd.edu!swrinde!gatech!news.ans.net!malgudi.oar.net!wariat.org!
mystis!dan@network.ucsd.edu
Subject: Getting an US license.
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

elendir@enst.fr (Elendir) writes:

```
> David R Tucker (drt@world.std.com) wrote:
> :: Vince. (13 weeks, ...)
>
> : (For your French callsign, I suppose?)
>
> Yup. I'm gonna phone the administration today to see what's going on.
>
> : Hmm. I've always wondered about this. Will you have immunity? Then
> : it's easy, I guess - you just operate under your French license.
```

>
> I don't think so, at least I am not sure. The problem is : I'll be doing
> my military service, and therefore be considered as a military agent (though
> I am not sure of this). Gosh, what a mess :)
>
> : No such luck? Then you have to determine whether you are legally
> : "a representative of a foreign government." My guess would be no,
> : but it's only a guess. That would mean you could either apply
> : for a reciprocal permit (good 1 year, you can apply again each year),
> : or just get an FCC license.
>
> I'll surely try to get both, possibly begin with a reciprocal FCC license,
> then try to get the extra exam.
>
> : I'm not sure it's possible to be both "a representative of a foreign
> : government" and to be lacking in the immunity that exempts one from
> : coming under US law and being required to get some form of FCC
> : authorization, since I've never seen the term defined. My guess is
> : that it is not possible, and that that dilemma never happens, but
> : you'll probably have to ask the FCC to be sure - unless someone else
> : on the net knows better! This address ***might*** work:
>
> In fact, I wonder if the ambassies or consulates have many hams working for
> them. My guess would be no :)
>
> Thanx for the address, I'll try to write, and as soon as I get an answer,
> I'll forward it to you.
>
> Many thnks again for the heelp.
>
> Vincent.
>

Vincent,

If you operate strictly from the embassy, being that it is French soil
and the FCC has no jurisdiction, you could then use your french license.

(Let us know when it gets there!)

73,

Dan N8PKV

--
"We are all now safe from crime. The Brady 'Law' has taken effect.
All can sleep peacefully knowing our paternalistic government will
take care and protect us! Of course I also believe in Santa Claus,

The Easter Bunny, The Tooth Fairy and The Great Pumpkin!"

Date: Tue, 1 Mar 1994 16:48:22 GMT
From: ihnp4.ucsd.edu!library.ucla.edu!news.ucdavis.edu!chip.ucdavis.edu!
ez006683@network.ucsd.edu
Subject: Morse Whiners
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

William=E.=Newkirk%Pubs%GenAv.Mlb@ns14.cca.CR.rockwell.COM wrote:
: >and contrary to the belief of some technician class licensees, the ITU
: >requirements for morse knowledge for HF access are NOT likely to change.
:
: i don't have my references really all that handy, but the US was the country
: that pushed to retain this requirement last time around, if i recall
: correctly. the rest of the world is probably ready to let it drop.
:
: as it was they moved the line from 144 to 30 MHz as a compromise.
IF most of the other nations are ready to drop the morse requirement and
there is a clause for doing so in the ITU, why has only Japan opted to
drop code for one of their HF licenses? There is a method for achieving
their goal and there is a precedent. Is their desire to drop Morse
published anywhere ITU preceedings perhaps? If so please post a source,
more ammo you know!

73,
Dan

--

* Daniel D. Todd Packet: KC6UUD@KE6LW.#nocal.ca.usa *
* Internet: ddtodd@ucdavis.edu *
* Snail Mail: 1750 Hanover #102 *
* Davis CA 95616 *

* All opinions expressed herein are completely fictitious any *
* resemblance to actual opinions of persons living or dead is *
* completely coincidental. *

Date: Tue, 01 Mar 94 09:05:14 EST
From: ihnp4.ucsd.edu!swrinde!gatech!news.ans.net!malgudi.oar.net!wariat.org!
mystis!dan@network.ucsd.edu
Subject: On the lite side...
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

jherman@uhunix3.uhcc.Hawaii.Edu (Jeff Herman) writes:

[stuff deleted]

> Just to amplify what Dan said, the State of Hawaii has just passed the
> toughest handgun control law in the nation: One cannot purchase a
> handgun unless one can show a just reason for needing one, such as
> having received threats to one's life. As a result, handgun sales
> for the past two months (the law just took effect) have been at
> record level; probably more handguns have been sold the last couple
> of months than would have been sold over a several year period.

What was that about the 'will of the people'...

> Hawaiian weather report: 84 degrees today, 64 last night (still need
> a blanket at night - phooey).
> ^
> only one, though (hee hee hee)
>
> Jeff NH6IL

--
Samuel Adams:"The Constitution shall never be construed to prevent people of
the United States who are peaceable citizens from keeping their own arms."
During Massachusetts' U.S. Constitution ratification convention, (1788)

Date: Tue, 01 Mar 94 10:13:00 EST
From: ihnp4.ucsd.edu!swrinde!gatech!news.ans.net!malgudi.oar.net!wariat.org!
mystis!dan@network.ucsd.edu
Subject: rec.dan.pickersgill.monologue
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

patrick_tatro@stortek.com (Patrick Tatro) writes:

> In article <Rs+L3EA.edellers@delphi.com> Ed Ellers <edellers@delphi.com> writ
> >From: Ed Ellers <edellers@delphi.com>
>
> >Why all the name calling?
>
> Name Calling? - malcontent No Code Technicians - get out your Webster's
> dictionary and you will find that I was saying that you aren't happy.

The term is OFTEN used in a derogatory fashion on the net.

> >More to the point, why is it so important to you to limit access to ALL mode
> >HF to those who have learned a special skill for ONE mode that is not needed
> >for effective use of others?
>
> I know Ed you are going to say that you aren't capable of learning that
> skill so it's unfair. The bottom line is, if you want to use the HF
> frequencies, you will have to learn the Morse Code. You can post your feeling
> here all year long but that won't buy you a thing. I would suggest that if you
> are having trouble learning the code you ask for help. There are a lot of
> people ready and willing to help you with this skill. There is free software
> on the net and free code sessions on the air for you to learn.
>
> The debate on right or wrong is mute - the requirement stands today and I
> don't plan to let it stand in my way.

Neither do I. However it does stand in the way of some. And it may stand
today, will it stand tomorrow? I doubt it. Either by elimination of
Morse testing or elimination of Amateur Radio, but it will go.

Dan

--
"We are all now safe from crime. The Brady 'Law' has taken effect.
All can sleep peacefully knowing our paternalistic government will
take care and protect us! Of course I also believe in Santa Claus,
The Easter Bunny, The Tooth Fairy and The Great Pumpkin!"

Date: 01 Mar 1994 16:04:44 GMT
From: ihnp4.ucsd.edu!swrinde!gatech!newsxfer.itd.umich.edu!sol.ctr.columbia.edu!
news.cs.columbia.edu!mix-cs!popovich@network.ucsd.edu
Subject: What? No comments??
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

C.) The article was too long and I'm too damned lazy to read it.

But I went back and took a look at it after seeing this humorous
follow-up post of yours.

> The problem is the current licensing structure with regard to THEORY. Not
> only has the theory been "dumbed down" and made too simple, THE INCENTIVE
> SYSTEM IS BACKWARDS! Yes, it's just fine to require CW for HF access since
> the ITU requires it. I'm talking theory here. The current structure with
> the codeless tech license makes VHF and above look like the "beginners way"
> into ham radio while high power HF global communication is something every
> HAM should aspire to. Is this way of thinking encouraging the high-tech modes
> given the advances being made in commercial RF? The tougher tests should give

> you access to UHF and up, NOT 30 MHz and below! We need to encourage technical
> competence in the bands of the 1990s. Those bands, ladies and gentlemen, are
> ABOVE 30 MHz, not below.

An interesting idea, but the current "Incentive Licensing" system is set up to make people generally want to upgrade. Your system would be one where just about everybody would remain at the "codeless Tech" level, since d**n few hams care about UHF and up. There just aren't that many experimenters in the hobby.

> I really don't think the above should be done, but here is the point. In
> my opinion, the current system does not encourage experimentation on the
> "high-tech" bands. Radio amateurs are respected more based on their
> number of worldwide HF contacts rather than technical accomplishments
> using local, high-speed digital modes or more advanced forms of analog
> voice communication.

IMHO, the people who are natural experimenters will experiment, whether they are "encouraged" to do so or not -- it's in their blood. Also, the people who are not natural experimenters will not experiment, whether we :-) are "encouraged" to do so or not -- we're lazy. "Advancing the state of the radio art" is only one of the five principles of the Amateur Radio Service, not a sine qua non.

> Warning!! Here's a suggestion that will REALLY ruffle a few feathers!!
> It is also meant to be taken with a rather LARGE grain of salt.
> The code and the theory requirements currently work as a "filter" to keep
> the HF bands from overcrowding and turning into another form of citizens
> band. On the contrary, if it WERE easier to get on HF, the band would
> indeed become more crowded and technically competent radio amateurs would be
> forced to both move to higher frequencies AND develop more technically
> advanced HF forms of modulation and communication that cut through all the
> HF QRM and QRN.

"Move to higher frequencies" works at VHF and UHF frequencies, because at those frequencies basically all the bands have line-of-sight propagation characteristics. It's just more difficult, and more expensive, to work at microwave frequencies and above. At VHF and above, the serious experimenters go to the higher frequencies, where they are not bothered by the common crowd, while those who just want to chat on the local repeater or log into the local packet BBS hang out on the lower frequencies, like 2m and 440. (220 has been largely passed over, probably because of the feeling of impending doom a few years ago when we lost part of the band to UPS, which didn't even use the thing in the end. Sigh.)

At HF, though, there are no other frequencies available to move to, that have the same desirable propagation characteristics. The whole

purpose of HF is long-distance communication between stations not connected by any particular "network" infrastructure. It comes in handy when something like an earthquake or a hurricane has wiped out the infrastructure in an area. :-) Putting more people on HF would just overload the bands even more than they are now. You might have a point with "develop[ing] more technically advanced HF forms of modulation", except that IMHO, we really can't get much narrower and keep anything like the forms of communication that we have now. I just don't see it happening. Someone more knowledgeable than I can post the theoretical lower bounds on bandwidths for passing, say, voice and various rates of data (I dimly recall studying such things at one time, but it's not the sort of knowledge that I use every day), but whatever they may be exactly, we're very close to them as it is. With the HF bands being as narrow as they are, there are only so many bits of information that you can pack into their limited bandwidth. Admittedly, the current data modes are rather inefficient because they're based on old modem technology (and museum-piece teleprinter technology, in some cases :-), but you're not going to get an order-of-magnitude compression out of something like an SSB or CW signal. Maybe you'll get a factor of 2 or 3, but that's not worth all that much. Besides, in a hobby where some people are still using full DSB AM, how quickly can you expect everybody to move to your new, lower-bandwidth forms of modulation? There's a lot of old equipment out there, and hams are cheap b***ards. :-) Many of them aren't going to buy your wonderful new equipment until it's been on the used market for a number of years. Ain't ham radio wonderful?

-Steve, WB3I

Date: Tue, 1 Mar 1994 16:39:16 GMT
From: ihnp4.ucsd.edu!library.ucla.edu!news.ucdavis.edu!chip.ucdavis.edu!
ez006683@network.ucsd.edu
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

References <2ke0ns\$ns4@sugar.NeoSoft.COM>, <5y+J0dr.edellers@delphi.com>, <patrick_tattro.31.7C5
Subject : Re: rec.dan.pickersgill.monologue

Patrick Tattro (patrick_tattro@stortek.com) wrote:

: The debate on right or wrong is mute - the requirement stands today and I
: don't plan to let it stand in my way.
First of all it isn't mute because I can 'hear' it, it may be moot but
that is probably not the case either since the FCC bases many of its NPRM
on petitions from the general public. Therefore, discussing possible FCC
regulation changes is definitely not moot. Changes are made to the regs
and these changes are based on petitions from us. How can this be moot?

Most likely we will not see a complete elimination of a code exam in the next 10 years nor will we see a requirement for retesting in this time, or a stiffening of tech requirements, or the elimination of all licensing requirements. If you think these are moot then you can mute them.

: 73's
best wishes's to you too,
Dan

--

* Daniel D. Todd Packet: KC6UUD@KE6LW.#nocal.ca.usa *
* Internet: ddtodd@ucdavis.edu *
* Snail Mail: 1750 Hanover #102 *
* Davis CA 95616 *

* All opinions expressed herein are completely fictitious any *
* resemblance to actual opinions of persons living or dead is *
* completely coincidental. *

Date: Tue, 1 Mar 1994 16:54:03 GMT
From: ihnp4.ucsd.edu!library.ucla.edu!news.ucdavis.edu!chip.ucdavis.edu!
ez006683@network.ucsd.edu
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

References <CLwLnE.75G@ucdavis.edu>, <oRogic5w165w@mystis.wariat.org>,
<rcrw90-280294152637@waters.corp.mot.com.corp.mot.com>, i
Subject : Re: On the lite side...

Mike Waters (rcrw90@email.mot.com) wrote:

: Don, for what it is worth, the Arizona constitution has an explicit
: individual "right to bear arms"! Spelled out in words of few syllables no
: less.

I wish I could say the same for California. I just heard on the news the other day that someone got a wild hair up their arse and proposed legislation that would outlaw the sale, importation and manufacture of handguns in the state. I doubt it will pass though congressman Roberti is going through a recall in Sept. because he proposed the "assault weapons" ban, which did pass.

: And we have every bit as nice a climate as Jeff does :-)
Miles and miles of beach but no ocean, which really sucks for all us SCUBA divers.

Dan

--

* Daniel D. Todd Packet: KC6UUD@KE6LW.#nocal.ca.usa *

* Internet: ddtodd@ucdavis.edu *

* Snail Mail: 1750 Hanover #102 *

* Davis CA 95616 *

* All opinions expressed herein are completely fictitious any *

* resemblance to actual opinions of persons living or dead is *

* completely coincidental. *

End of Ham-Policy Digest V94 #92
